CHRISTIANITY AND THE LABOR MOVEMENT

WILLIAM M. BALCH

FEB 6 1967

1.00 net

CHRISTIANITY AND THE LABOR MOVEMENT

BY

WILLIAM MONROE BALCH

Formerly Secretary of the Methodist Federation for Social Service

LIBRARY OF
UNITED THEOLOGICAL SE
HD
6338
.B253
1912

BOSTON
SHERMAN, FRENCH & COMPANY
1912

Copyright, 1912
Sherman, French & Company

TO THE MEMORY OF

THE REVEREND MANNING BROWN BALCH

MY FATHER

UNITED THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

B 6 1967

FOREWORD

The labor problem may be considered with regard to conditions or theories or duties. The relation of Christianity to the labor movement is essentially ethical and is here discussed chiefly in that aspect. Hence conditions and theories affecting the labor problem are not treated exhaustively, but only in those essentials in which the conditions create and the theories may explain the duties in view. To enforce the urgent social mission of the Church, to indicate the critical duties thrust upon us by the labor problem, to mark some paths toward timely social service, are the purposes of the present study of Christianity and the Labor Movement.

Considerable portions of this volume formerly appeared in a series of articles contributed to "Methodist Men" by the present writer and are published in the following chapters by courtesy of the editor of that periodical.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I	Perspective and Proportions . .	1
II	The Estrangement of the Church and the Wage-Earners . . .	9
III	Labor's Complaint Against the Church	18
IV	Labor's Complaint Against the Social Order	28
V	The Cheapness of Human Life	42
VI	What Church-Men Should Know about Labor Unions	53
VI	What Wage-Earners Should Know about the Church . .	70
VIII	The Social Creed of the Church	80
IX	Socialism	91
X	What Christian Men Should Do	100

I

PERSPECTIVE AND PROPORTIONS

Organized religion and organized labor are chief dynamic factors in the progress of modern society. Organized capital is also a great social factor but is conservative rather than progressive. No menace to the future can be so serious as a lasting estrangement between the labor movement and Christianity. No emergency could be more critical than the present and pressing necessity of a better understanding and a more cordial coöperation between the Church and the labor unions.

It is primarily important for the modern Christian man to see the labor movement in its true proportions and perspective. Those who think of it as a "modern inconvenience," or a sort of cutaneous eruption on the surface of the social body, have all but missed the meaning of past history and present times. What, then, is the labor movement?

Richard T. Ely says, "The labor movement, then, in its broadest terms, is the effort of men to live the lives of men. . . . The end and purpose of it all is a richer existence for the

toilers, and that with respect to mind, soul, and body." [1]

Dean Hodges says, "It is a product partly of the discontent which is at the heart of progress, and partly of the fraternal spirit which is of the essence of the Christian religion." [2]

Charles P. Neill, United States Commissioner of Labor, says that the labor movement is "the systematic organization of crafts or of industries to secure control of the amount of wages they will receive, the hours they will work, and the conditions under which they will perform their labor." [3]

The foregoing definitions may be summarized by saying that the labor movement is the industrial aspect of democracy; that is, industry of the people, for the people, and by the people. And Christianity is the religious interpretation of democracy; that is, religion of the people, for the people, and by the people. Thus Christianity and the labor movement are in vital affinity, and "what God hath joined together, let no man put asunder."

What are the facts that warrant so large an estimate of the labor movement?

First, human history itself. In the words

[1] Quoted in "The Social Application of Religion," pp. 64-65.

[2] "Faith and Social Service," p. 144.

[3] See "The Social Application of Religion," p. 63.

of Commissioner Neill, "The most of us realize that this labor movement is a world-wide movement, but we do not realize that it is a world-old one. Yet this is the keynote to the whole subject, and until we do understand this, we cannot correctly gauge any other aspect of it." [4] "The economic interpretation of history," a working principle of all scientific historians, implies as one of its essentials, that the facts of history are at no point intelligible save with reference to the struggles of the laboring classes to raise their standards of living.

It is a modern reading, but not altogether a misreading, of the old story of the Exodus which characterizes it as a strike preceded by a demand on the part of a walking delegate for a living wage and a recognition of the union. It has been discussed somewhat in this view by at least two accredited authorities.

The history of Rome is essentially that of the economic struggle of the masses against the classes and the decline of classic civilization is essentially a story of the labor movement moving the wrong way. [5]

Through the middle ages there were no more momentous movements than the abolition of slavery and serfdom; the peasant revolts, such

[4] "The Social Application of Religion," p. 66.

[5] Cf. Mommsen: "History of Rome," Vol. 3, pp. 304-305.

as those of Tyler and Cade in England, of the Jacquerie in France, of the Anabaptists in Germany; and the rise and power of trade-guilds in the cities of all Europe. Upon these facts and forces, all of them obviously phases of the continuous and underlying labor movement, depended the rise and fall of feudalism, and then of absolute monarchy, together with the possibilities of the religious reformation.

Since the French Revolution the general establishment of popular governments in the civilized world has been based upon the political, social, and economic enfranchisement of the working classes. In Great Britain, the Factory Acts prohibiting the exploitation of labor; the repeal of the Conspiracy Laws which had hitherto made illegal the organization of labor; the Compensation Acts, relieving labor of the fearful cost in life and limb incident to modern industry; the great social equities of the Lloyd-George Budget followed closely by state-insurance of the working classes against old age, sickness and unemployment, and the establishment of minimum wage boards,—these are simply the statutory way-marks in the progress of the labor movement. And is it too much to say that the anti-slavery movement culminating in the Civil War and the subsequent rise of labor-unionism are the most vital facts of American history?

Commissioner Neill again says truly, "The labor movement is a struggle that has gone on since the beginning of the political history of society—a ceaseless and endless conflict—going back to the first effort of the subjugated and disfranchised to overthrow oppression, to sweep away privilege, and coming down to the present struggle to secure complete equality of opportunity for all men alike to work out their highest individual destinies, and for each to live the deepest, the fullest, the richest life possible, and to develop to the fullest all the capacities with which his Creator may have endowed him." [6]

This large conception of the labor movement is further warranted by the New Testament laws of labor.

First, we have the law of the divine dignity of labor; "Whatsoever ye do, do it heartily as to the Lord." The conditions of toil must be transformed from the sordid to the sacramental. Labor's task is to perfect God's material creation. When God made the world, He saw indeed that it was good. But it was only a good beginning. It was a universe of raw materials, and He left it for the carpenters, the miners, the smiths, the weavers, and all hand-workers of subsequent times to take

[6] See "The Social Application of Religion," pp. 68-69.

those raw materials and work them over into the varied forms of beauty and usefulness which were to enrich and comfort the life of man. And so it was a fitting thing that God's Son, when he came as a Man, came also as a Carpenter.

Labor's task is also the perfecting of humanity. The human race, like the physical universe, is in raw material. And in daily toil, not only commodities, but character is the product.

Again we have the Christian law of labor's liberty. To an oppressed and revolutionary workingman the Christ declared that God being the Father of all, "then are the children free." And the labor movement, in making for equality of opportunity, is achieving that only sort of liberty which is consistent with good order and economic progress and so fulfills the law of Christ.

Thirdly, we have the Christian law of industrial democracy, "Ye know that the rulers of the Gentiles lord it over them, and their great ones exercise authority over them. Not so shall it be among you, but whosoever would be great among you shall be your minister, and whosoever would be first among you shall be your servant; even as the Son of man came not to be ministered unto but to minister, and to give his life a ran-

som for many." On a fair interpretation, these words seem to be identical with labor's demand for a share in the control as well as in the profits of industry. As Lyman Abbott says, "Autocracy in industry has had a fair trial with disastrous results. It has worked no better in industry than it has in the Church and in the State." [7] Of course the time will never come when business can be conducted without leaders, but the leaders must not be lords. In Christ's kingdom there will still be chieftains of industry, but the chieftain will be merely the chief servant and

> "Man to man, the warld o'er
> Will brothers be for a' that."

So the labor movement is vast, venerable, and vital,—venerable, because of its age-long potency in human history; vast, because of its implications and influences with regard to the general welfare of mankind; vital, because its moral ideas and results involve those things by which civilizations live and die and the kingdom of heaven prevails. In these characters the labor movement relates itself, all but identifies itself, with the vitality and progress of the kingdom of Christ. In that relation it is to be considered in these pages.

If it be asked, Why the Church and Labor

[7] "The Industrial Problem," p. 129.

rather than the Church and Capital, there are two sufficient answers. First, because labor is a function of life, while capital is a function of things. "At the last analysis labor means the laborer." [8] Second, because laborers are the rule, and capitalists the exception. As Professor Ely says, "The labor movement represents mankind as it is represented by no other manifestation of the life of the nations of the earth, because the vast majority of the race are laborers." [9]

[8] L. A. Banks: "Common Folks' Religion," p. 59.
[9] "The Social Application of Religion," p. 66.

II

THE ESTRANGEMENT OF THE CHURCH AND THE WAGE-EARNERS

The most startling truth that can be told is lately being told so often that it is ceasing to startle us. It is this: that the modern Church and the wage-earning class are mutually estranged. Unless we move out of our fool's paradise in time, the present estrangement may at last develop a life-and-death emergency. For the Christian Church, if finally alienated from the working-classes, would not be Christian. And the labor movement, uninspired by Christian ideals, would be sordid in motive and chaotic in result. And society at large, with its two most potent forces thus perverted, would suffer disaster in its most vital interests. Such calamity may seem far-off, but the means of averting it are near at hand to-day, though they may not be to-morrow. It is the purpose of the present chapter to inquire as to the extent, the nature, and the causes of the estrangement in question.

1. As to its extent, we must first of all get clear of the notion that the Church is suffer-

ing a general decline. A recent and widely-read book asserts the estrangement of the working-classes to be so complete that "church-membership is steadily declining in proportion to population."[1] Almost simultaneously with that statement appeared the notable Census Bulletin which reported that in sixteen years the membership of the churches of the United States had increased over 60 per cent., while population was increasing but 34 per cent. Nor can the former percentage be explained away by attributing it to immigration from Roman Catholic countries. For the Protestant church-membership has increased nearly 44 per cent., which is 10 per cent. faster than population. The writer quoted makes sweeping denial of the reliability of church statistics. In that regard it should be sufficient to note that such statistics usually afford inadequate rather than an excessive enumeration of actual adherents; witness the uncounted company of "brothers-in-law" and other supporters of the churches whose names are nowhere enrolled or reported.

Misleading inferences are also drawn from the proportion of wage-earners counted in Sunday congregations. It is thus overlooked that laborers, by the conditions of their life,

[1] C. B. Thompson: "The Churches and the Wage Earners," pp. viii and 7.

are necessarily irregular in church attendance. Even when they so desire, they are unable to maintain the same frequency of attendance as other social classes. With the extensive industrial employment of women this consideration becomes an increasing factor. A grave error is also made by those who overlook the millions of our working people adhering to the Romanist, the Greek and the Hebrew faiths. While our present concern is with Protestantism, we must not count these non-Protestant worshipers among "the estranged." It is, however, a matter of grave import that several million lapsed Romanists are to be found among the workingmen of this country, while we have it on good authority that there is also a serious "drift from the synagogue."

Nor should we forget, as is often done, that two of the most numerous elements in the wage-earning population are by no means estranged from the churches. First, there are the so-called "soft-handed" laborers—clerks, salesmen, book-keepers, and many kinds of "agents." Secondly, there are the manual laborers of all trades in the smaller towns and villages. These two classes, millions strong, together with the professional classes, who in their way are also wage-earners, probably constitute a majority of those who work for wages as well as a majority of adult church-members.

On the other hand, these wage-earners have little or no class-consciousness or group cohesion; they are not unionized, and their social and personal affinities are largely with the other social classes. In other words, *these who are not estranged are also not the laborers who make the labor movement.*

On the other hand, we are too complacent in citing the farmers as a class loyal to the Church. They are indeed laborers in the sense that they labor. But they are not "wage-earners"; they are capitalists. "Farm-hands," on the contrary, are wage-earners, and, we have much reason to believe, are also generally estranged from the Church. At the same time they sustain no active or direct part in the labor movement.

We have still to consider the manual laborers of the cities, together with railway and mine workers. These workingmen are class-conscious and unionized and are the movers of the labor movement. Are they estranged from the churches? Here we have come to the vital point in the modern social problem. Sadly be it said that the straws seem to indicate an adverse wind. President Plantz states that there were recently in this country 15,000,000 men between sixteen and thirty-five years of age, and that 6,000,000 were in touch with the Church and 9,000,000 out of touch with it,

whether Protestant or Catholic.[2] It has been ascertained that in London only about six per cent. of the people attend church, while in the suburbs the percentage is about twenty-nine. A similar, though less extreme, condition obtains in American cities. Ex-President Bascom states that in Pittsburg and Allegheny, with a working class population of some 300,000 and a Protestant membership of 48,000, only 10 per cent. of the latter were workingmen.[3] The present writer has made inquiry as to the labor-membership of his own denomination in certain cities.[4] Replies from seven city churches in six states afford the following results: aggregate membership of the churches replying, 3,300; number of members who are manual laborers, 570; domestic employees, 122; accountants, salesmen, stenographers, agents, clerks and teachers, 581; members of labor unions, 90. These figures should be considered in view of two qualifying facts; first, that most of the churches reporting are so conducted and environed as to reach an unusual proportion of working people; second, that in several of these churches the manual laborers reported as church-members were, in disproportionate number, women and minors. From the

[2] "The Church and the Social Problem," p. 197.
[3] "Social Theory," pp. 213-214.
[4] See "Methodist Men," October, 1910.

reports, thus explained, it seems on the one hand that these figures do not confirm the more alarming estimates sometimes made regarding the alienation of labor from the church, nor on the other hand, the easy optimism that sees no occasion for alarm at all. These figures, like others that have been compiled and analyzed with due care, seem to indicate that our city churches are not proportionately constituted of manual laborers and still less of trades-unionists. The seriousness of the matter lies not only in the great numbers thus alienated, but in the further facts: first, that the evil is characteristic of our cities, where all the social problems have appeared in their most difficult forms; second, that the classes concerned are practically inclusive of organized labor.

2. In what sense are the Church and the wage-earners estranged? A reliable answer is indicated in President Plantz's instructive correspondence with labor leaders. Of ninety-three who answered his inquiries, six expressed their attitude toward the Church as "cordial," eleven were "indifferent," seventy-three "dissatisfied," three "hostile." Positive hostility and positive cordiality seem to be exceptional, and indifference or dissatisfaction all but universal among those wage-workers now under consideration.[5] The more thoughtful among them

[5] "The Church and the Social Problem," p. 81.

often suspect that the labor movement is not understood by the Church, that laboring-men are not heartily welcomed to its worship and membership, that money or the want of it controls the Church. As to the less thoughtful, the Church is often not in their thoughts at all.

Nor is this all, or the worst. The Church, in much the same sense, is estranged from the wage-earners. While church-people are not, of course, positively hostile to laboring people, it is yet true that indifference and impatience too often mark the attitude of churchmen toward the labor movement. The Church thinks about as much and about as little of the union as the union does of the Church. Important as it is that workingmen should have a better appreciation of the Church, it is at least as important that churchmen should have a better appreciation of the labor movement.

3. The causes of this evil are not far to seek. It is only blind uncharity that attributes it to the "sinfulness of laboring men." In that case all classes would be estranged from the Church, "for all have sinned and come short of the glory of God." The chief cause of the workingman's indifference is probably his complete preoccupation with other things. Exhausting labor and the menace of poverty, the break-up of household regularity, the clatter of traffic and transportation, the brilliancy,

variety and excitement of life in the modern city, are more than enough to pre-engage the mind and overcharge the life of the workingman in advance of the somewhat tardy and not too-pressing solicitations of the Church. And when the indifference awakens into conscious dissatisfaction, it is chiefly by way of reaction against the seeming indifference of the Church toward the labor movement. This reaction may be greatly in excess of its occasion, but what should concern Christian men is that it should have any occasion at all Another chief cause of the evil is immigration, bringing to us, as it has, millions of workingmen who lose their old-world ideals of religion without acquiring the new.

We note with devout gratitude a tendency toward a better understanding on both sides. The *Outlook* recently said: "Certainly a few years ago there was abundant reason for the belief that most wage-earners, and particularly members of trades-unions, felt either unwelcome or unregarded in church, and, on the whole, when not indifferent, rather resentful that the churches had so little to say about their problems of life and about the relation of religion to their peculiar struggles. Within a few years, however, there has occurred a marked change."

Marking this change are such signs as the

organic declarations of the religious denominations concerning the labor problems, the observance of Labor Sunday, the opening of labor gatherings with prayer, the exchange of fraternal delegates between ministerial bodies and labor unions, the mutually gratifying utterances of Church press and labor press, and the work of the social service organizations of the several denominations and the Social Service Commission of the Federated Churches. Probably no man can speak in this regard with more authority than Charles Stelzle, who says: "While there is still considerable alienation of the workingman from the Church, there is no other class of men among whom there is this conspicuous movement *toward* the Church."[6]

And yet the breach is not closed.

[6] "The Church and Labor," p. 33.

III

LABOR'S COMPLAINT AGAINST THE CHURCH

"Let judgment begin at the house of the Lord." The Church can save neither the social order nor itself unless it shall recognize its own short-comings. Of these the most perilous is its estrangement from the labor movement, an estrangement largely due to mutual misunderstandings. Hence it is a primary necessity that churchmen should give a full, patient, and candid hearing to the complaints of laboring men against the Church. In so doing, our purpose must not be to controvert our critics, but to get a sympathetic understanding of their views, to judge and mend our own ways, and to find the common ground where they and we can work together for that grand-total of all human interests which we call the Kingdom of God.

A statement follows of labor's complaint against the Church. It may not be all the truth nor even all true, but it is urged by men who speak in good faith, and hence it should help us to know the truth.

1. It is charged that the Church "has always stood by the ruling classes, because—it did not dare to oppose the men or the government which gave it support."[1] In Richard Heath's phrase, it is "the captive City of God," and in the younger Henry George's, "the Nobles of Privilege are the chief patrons of the Church and have an overmastering influence."[2] In evidence of such charges they cite the coincidence of ecclesiastical wealth and popular poverty during the middle ages; the opposition of Luther to the rising of the German peasants; the alliance of King and Church against the Commons of England; Adam Smith's arraignment of the Church in the Eighteenth Century for its servility to wealth,[3] the attitude of American churches toward the anti-slavery movement; the almost unanimous vote of the English bishops in the House of Lords against the Workingmen's Compensation Act, the anti-liquor bills, and the Lloyd-George budget; the familiar clerical apologies for Standard Oil, and the opposition of prominent laymen to child-labor laws and social legislation of almost every sort.

It might seem easy to argue that all this

[1] See C. Stelzle: "The Church and Labor," p. 9.

[2] "The Menace of Privilege," p. 321.

[3] See "The Wealth of Nations," Book V, Ch. I, Part III, Art. III.

is only a part-truth, and even a perverted view of that part. But it will be more profitable for us to reflect on the part that is true in spite of partial or perverted views. There is at least occasion for complaint on the part of laborers and for concern on the part of churchmen.

2. It is charged that the Church is usually neutral when not hostile toward labor's efforts to uplift humanity. Josiah Strong writes that he "knows personally of a committee of labor men who tried to secure the passage of a law limiting child-labor, and in a great city not one clergyman could be found to give them more than casual help;" while, "in another city, some years ago, not one clergyman could be found to aid the bakers agitate for a law giving them Sunday rest." [4] The Commission of the Federated Churches of America found that in a recent and already historic strike for a weekly rest day, the local ministerial union had administered a sharp rebuke to the strikers for alleged disorders, but no corresponding rebuke to the employers who, for some years, had been requiring an unnecessary and increasing amount of Sunday labor. The Archbishop of Canterbury said that he worked seventeen hours a day, and had no time left to solve the prob-

[4] "The Gospel of the Kingdom," May, 1910, p. 62.

lem of the unemployed; to which Keir Hardie replied: "A religion which demands seventeen hours a day for organization and leaves no time for thought about starving men, women, and children, has no message for this age." [5] In other words, the Church is too much preoccupied with working its own machinery.

Of course it can be said again that this is only a partial truth. But again it will be better for us to dwell on the partial truth than on the partial error of such complaints. Or, we may point to the organic declarations of the several Protestant denominations and to those of their Federal Council, by all of which the churches are committed to the cause of labor and against all social injustice. To this the laboring men may reply that the Church, by such declarations, has not fully put itself in the right, but has rather acknowledged a standard of right by which not only the social order but the Church itself is to be judged. And workingmen are now asking with some sharpness whether our deeds are fulfilling the promise of our declarations.

3. A working-man asks: "Is it not a fact that in most churches to-day the great majority of so-called 'better class' people look down upon the workingman, who spends his life

[5] See "Annals of the American Academy of Social Science," Nov., 1907, p. 18.

in toiling for their necessities and luxuries, and do not associate with him as a brother?"[6] A distinguished High Church rector testifies that there are churches in which "the presence of the poor is regarded as bad form. If Christ himself were to enter them, the pew-opener would ask, What is that Carpenter doing here?"[7] A prominent English man of letters writes: "I regard pews and pew-rents as distinctly anti-Christian. They foster class-distinctions. They keep the poor at a distance. They encourage snobbishness, and give point to the sneer that Churches only want those who are able to pay." Personally, one may be sure that much of this appearance of exclusiveness is a misunderstanding due to differences between the conventional manners of the rich and the poor. Nevertheless, every man who travels is probably acquainted, as is the writer, with churches where a measure of snobbery is unmistakable. It were better for the Church to be patient under a hundred false suspicions than to countenance this abomination in a single instance.

4. Wage-earners join the outcry against the discrepancy between the way we worship on

[6] See George Haw: "Christianity and the Working Classes," p. 4, cf. p. 144.

[7] Quoted by H. George, Jr.; "The Menace of Privilege," p. 407.

Sunday and the way we do business on Monday. They declare that many of the injustices which they combat are practiced by men who seem to be acceptable members of the Churches. I still believe that churchmen are responsible less often than other employers for such abuses as child-labor, unfenced machinery, unsanitary shops, and unjust blacklisting. Nevertheless the difference is so inconsiderable that workingmen seeking work do not usually inquire which employers are church-members and which are not. And without conceding all that is said concerning such inconsistencies, it is yet undeniable that the moral teachings of the Church have not yet proved effective to the degree of making social injustices equally scandalous with drunkenness or adultery on the part of church-members.

5. Wage-earners charge the Church with culpable ignorance. The Hon. Arthur Henderson, M. P., one of the world's great labor leaders and also a leader in Christian work, writes thus: "The Churches have not appreciated the real meaning and the true inwardness of many of the movements which the workers themselves have initiated and developed for their social and industrial amelioration. . . . Possessed of only a very superficial knowledge of the question, the Churches, for instance have concluded that unemployment

was mainly due to intemperance, pauperism, the result of thriftlessness, and like the Priest and the Levite, they have passed by on the other side."[8] Or consider the exasperating untactfulness of the ministers who lately asked of a body of strikers, "Is it reasonable to expect that, by attacking your employer openly and in secret and by trying to destroy his property and his business, you can best persuade him to deal generously and magnanimously with you?" No one ought to meddle with labor controversies until he understands that self-respecting workingmen regard as an insult the insinuation that they ask for "generosity" or "magnanimity" or anything else than simple justice.

No graver duty rests with Christian men than to understand the labor problem. They must know it by careful study of economic authorities and by living and fraternal contact with the laboring people. They must know what the gospel has to say about it and how that gospel applies to the crisis of to-day. Otherwise the Church remains at fault.

6. We must consider without pre-judgment the workingman's complaint that we are often unjust and inconsistent in our criticisms of the labor movement. He says that we often con-

[8] See George Haw: "Christianity and the Working Classes," pp. 120, 134.

demn a great and beneficent social movement because of certain minor incidents; that we are content with hearing one side of the controversy, and that the anti-labor side. He adds that the Church itself "need not go very far back in its own history to find duplicated nearly everything we deplore in Organized Labor today, even down to boycotting and slugging," [9] witness certain memories of Smithfield and of Boston Common. Or, with modern reference, he complains that we denounce the unions for certain practices which we follow in the churches; for instance, that "the ministry is a closed shop, guarding its privileges as jealously as does the average trade-union."

7. Wage-workers complain of the Church "that it teaches the poor to be submissive under *present* injustice, since all things will be made right in heaven." Or, as Ruskin puts it, "You knock a man into the ditch and then tell him to remain content in the position in which Providence has placed him." Perhaps it is nearer the truth to say that the patience we preach in these days is an active patience,—invincible perseverance, optimism, courage and unselfishness, striving not indeed to revenge wrongs but to rectify them. Yet under labor's error here, lies an error of the Church. For

[9] C. Stelzle: "The Church and Labor," pp. 11 and 14.

has not the Church hitherto, while duly witnessing for providence and immortality, somewhat failed in witnessing for social justice? And have we duly developed the masculine and militant type of piety?

8. "We labor men," writes Arthur Henderson, "are not unmindful of the vast amount of effort the Churches are making; visiting the sick, clothing the naked, feeding the hungry, comforting the sorrowing. What we deplore is the fact that co-incident with such relief the Churches have not attempted to get at the root-cause of all the evil and distress. If they would display the same amount of energy in seeking to eradicate from our collective life the evil it contains, that they have shown in seeking to deliver the individual life from sin, there would have been less call for their relief work." [10] Concerning this charge there is one comment to be made: it is substantially true.

A final summary is thus put into a parable by Hugh Price Hughes: Someone was commending a certain preacher in highest terms. But a listener made this unanswerable answer: "After all, he doesn't remind me of Jesus Christ." *Zion's Herald* adds: "The minister and the Church may be doing very creditable and useful work, but they are not Christian in

[10] See G. Haw: Op. cit. p. 135.

the full and essential use of the term if the laboring man is still able to say, 'They do not remind me of Jesus Christ.' "

IV

LABOR'S COMPLAINT AGAINST THE SOCIAL ORDER

One of the great religious denominations has lately made the organic declaration: "We cordially declare our fraternal interest in the aspirations of the laboring classes, and our desire to assist them in the righting of every wrong." Are there any such wrongs to be righted? Labor answers with the following grave complaints against the social order, namely, non-employment, over-employment, unjust distribution, unfair discrimination, and the under-appraisement of humanity. The first four will be considered in the present and the fifth in our next chapter.

1. NON-EMPLOYMENT

Truly said Carlyle: "A man willing to work and unable to find work is perhaps the saddest sight that Fortune's inequality exhibits under the sun." Always there are many such men. Not long ago there were probably three million in the United States. Organized wage-earners probably suffer the least from this cause and yet we have it on the authority of the New York

State Commission that "organized workers lose on the average twenty per cent. of their possible income through unemployment." [1]

It is a two-fold wrong. First, to the laboring man, because the right to labor is a necessary corollary of the right to life. The world owes no man a living but does owe every man a chance to make a living. Unemployment is also a wrong to society. The unemployed often become the unemployable. The idle are natural candidates for mendicancy, vagrancy and crime, and are often forced into pauperism, temporary or chronic. The New York Commission gives data from the charitable societies showing that "from twenty-five to thirty-five per cent. of those who apply to them for relief every year have been brought to their destitute condition primarily through lack of work." [2]

On these facts Louis D. Brandeis makes the following just comments: "Some irregularity in employment is doubtless inevitable; but in the main irregularity is remediable. It has been overcome with great profit to both employer and employee in important businesses which have recognized the problem as one seriously demanding solution. Society and industry need only the necessary incentive to secure a

[1] See "The Otulook," June 10, 1911, pp. 293-294.
[2] See "The Outlook," loc. cit.

great reduction in irregularity of employment. In the scientifically managed business irregularity tends to disappear. So far as it is irremediable it should be compensated for like the inevitable accident." [3]

2. OVER-EMPLOYMENT

Not only are many who ought to work deprived of work, but many who work are overworked, and many who ought not to work are compelled to work. Nor is it relevant to say that there is no law of nature prescribing the eight-hour day. The law of nature does prescribe that the hours of work must not pass the "point at which normal fatigue becomes pathological fatigue." For it is known to science that over-work literally poisons the worker. And with physical comes spiritual demoralization. Twelve hours a day for seven days in the week, the actual labor-time of many thousands, means the abolition of life save in its animal and mechanical processes. The workingman is often told that he works no harder nor longer than his employer. But he knows that all factories are open earlier than most offices, that employers take summer vacations and foreign tours, while he himself rarely travels except on foot hunting a job, and that even the hardest-working employer is working

[3] See "The Outlook," loc. cit.

for himself and his own ambition, which makes the greatest difference in the world.

The supreme evil of over-employment is the exploitation of the labor of women and children. Concerning the former, for instance, it is a law of nature that women should work fewer hours per day and fewer days per month than men, and when economic greed violates this law the penalty in disqualified motherhood is the costliest price that human society can pay for its sins. The present coincidence between the diminished general birth-rate and the increased birth-rate of defectives and degenerates is the most disheartening portent that now appears, or could appear, at this time of social crisis. And these two ominous facts are attributable, according to high authority, in large measure to the overstrain of modern industrialism, particularly in its exhausting demands on womanhood.[4]

In the United States some two million children under sixteen years of age are gainfully employed. Of these, 800,000 are ten to thirteen years old, unknown thousands under ten, and 400,000 engaged in occupations usually deleterious to child-life.[5] Yet figures are inadequate. For the tragedy of the pres-

[4] Dr. M. G. Schlapp in "The Outlook," April 6, 1912, p. 782.

[5] The New Encyclopedia of Social Reform, art. "Child Labor."

ent is only suggestive of the consequences yet to ensue. The evil does not end with the pain and pleading of the children. Beyond these is the evil which society must suffer in its most vital interests,—the standard of living, the integrity of the home, and the future intelligence and efficiency of its citizens. In some coming crisis of our history, the alternative may then be decided by the votes of illiterates and degenerates, or its armies destroyed by bacilli more deadly than bullets.

3. UNJUST DISTRIBUTION

Labor complains of three conditions under which it gets less than its equitable share of the total economic product.

First, when it gets less than a living wage. The New York City Charity Organization estimates $800 to $900 per annum as a living wage in that city for a man with average family.[6] In this light ponder the fact that some million families enjoy an annual income of less than $500[7] and that our average factory wages are $572.[8] Surely all family-incomes falling below the latter average are less than a living wage, and such families include

[6] See E. T. Devine: "Misery and its causes" pp. 107-108.

[7] See articles in the *American Magazine*, March, 1907, by J. Jacobs and March, 1910, by Ida M. Tarbell.

[8] See "The Survey," Sept. 3, 1910, p. 810.

a large proportion of our working population.

Again, labor receives less than its share whenever others receive more than theirs. One per cent. of our people own 50 per cent. of the wealth and nine per cent. own 71 per cent.[9] Can we believe that one per cent. of the people have earned as much as the other ninety-nine per cent.? Or nine per cent. of us, two and a half times as much as the other ninety-one per cent.? The presumption thus raised seems quite conclusive when we note the sources of these fortunes. The New York *Tribune* has published a list of 1103 millionaires in that city. It further appears that three-fourths of these men had derived their wealth chiefly from some form of economic surplus,—as monopoly, marginal betting, unearned increment of land, some sort of "special privilege,"—or in one word, plunder. For all this wealth had been produced by somebody, and any part of it not produced by those who have taken it, must have been taken from those who have produced it, namely, the wage-earning class. All this gives too much reality to such familiar and unlovely phrases as "predatory wealth," "the favored few," and "the disinherited masses." As Henry D. Lloyd said, "The fortunes of these lords of industry and these interceptors of

[9] See J. Bascom: "Social Theory," p. 269, and R. T. Ely: "Socialism and Social Reform," pp. 274-275.

trade are not remuneration for services,—they are the ransom paid by the people for their lives."

Thirdly, it appears that labor receives less than its share when it receives a diminishing proportion of the increase of wealth. Note that it is not said "portion" but "proportion." For the following calculations approximate correctness, not absolute exactness, is claimed.[10] From 1860 to 1880 the per capita wealth of the country increased 70 per cent., while real wages (measured in purchasing power) had not increased, perhaps had slightly decreased. From 1881 to 1900 per capita wealth had increased 43 per cent. and real wages not more than 25 per cent. From 1900 to 1910 money-wages increased about 19 per cent., but owing to disproportionate increase in prices, real wages decreased at least 11 per cent. And yet, during only four years of this latter period the national wealth had increased twenty billion dollars, the greatest advance in material pros-

[10] Cf. R. T. Ely: "The Evolution of Industrial Society," pp. 103, 112-113; W. Gladden: "Applied Christianity," p. 120; the Aldrich Senate Report, 1893, on "Wholesale Prices, Wages," etc., Part I, p. 100; the publications of the American Statistical Association, March, 1899, article by Professor C. J. Bullock; The New Encyclopædia of Social Reform, p. 1266; Bulletins of the U. S. Bureau of Labor, 1900, p. 914, and March, 1902, p. 235; "The Outlook," March 12, 1910, p. 570.

perity ever recorded in the history of any nation.

Again the wrong to labor re-acts upon society. For social cohesion is weakened and social progress checked when a great social class, unable to share proportionately in the general prosperity, is thus fore-doomed to thwarted effort and chronic discontent. With regard to the rich who will not work and the poor who can't get work, labor has a grievance until all men are laborers.

4. UNFAIR DISCRIMINATION

Labor complains that its cause has not been given an impartial hearing, and that the higher ideals and influences of the labor movement and of the labor unions have not been duly recognized. The public press is necessarily owned by capital and edited by men belonging to the so-called "higher classes," and hence, in spite of good intentions, often seems to give labor less than a square deal. For instance, the frequent assumption that labor-unionism is nothing else than organized disorder is largely due to the fact that the worse features of unionism are always given the widest publicity, and the better often quite ignored. The National Civic Federation, perhaps better qualified than any other agency to render a discriminating and unbiased finding, has published

a most impressive protest against the injustice thus done the cause of labor.[11]

Labor complains of less than a square deal in the courts. Mr. Roosevelt thus defines the position which he holds in common with the representatives of the laboring-class: "I do not for one moment believe that the masses of our judges are actuated by any but worthy motives. Nevertheless, I do believe that they often signally fail to protect the laboring man and the laboring man's widow and children in their just rights and that heart-breaking and pitiful injustice too often results therefrom; and this primarily because our judges lack either the opportunity or the power thoroughly to understand the working man's and working woman's position and vital needs." [12] In this regard it is to be noted, first, that the expense of litigation largely nullifies for the poor man the principle of equality before the law. Justice at the end of his suit is an empty promise unless meanwhile he can afford to pay for "legal talent" and "the law's delay." It is no less an authority than President Taft who says: "The one thing which disgraces our civilization today is the delays of civil and criminal justice and these delays always work in favor of the

[11] See Adams and Sumner: "Labor Problems," p. 211n. Cf. J. Bascom: "Social Theory," pp. 109, 114.

[12] "The New Nationalism."

man with the longest purse." [13] At a recent date there were pending in the courts two cases of workingmen's claims still undertermined after ten years of litigation and another after eleven years. [14] And now comes the report of damages awarded to an injured workingman after twenty-two years of litigation, the crowning disgrace of American judicature. [15] In nearly every nation of Europe these poor people would have received immediate justice without having to go to law at all. Furthermore, as said by George L. Bolen, one of the severest critics of organized labor, "The courts are too often bound unduly by the views and predilections of the capitalistic class to which by birth and association they belong." [16] This may account in part for some of the antiquated precedents which govern employers' liability, freedom of contract, class legislation, and the writ of injunction, all serving to put working people at a disadvantage in the courts. As to injunctions, laboring-men may often be in the wrong. Nevertheless many of us will agree that the workingmen are in the right when protesting that the injunction power is abused when used as follows: (1) to enjoin men

[13] See *McClure's Magazine,* June, 1910, p. 151.
[14] Do, p. 154.
[15] See "The Outlook," Dec. 23, 1911, p. 924.
[16] "Getting a Living," p. 565.

from doing concertedly what they have the legal right to do individually: (2) as a subterfuge for depriving unconvicted men of trial by jury: (3) to suspend men's rights without notice and then leave them undetermined pending a long-deferred hearing.

At present there is a great outcry against any criticism of the courts at all. Mr. Roosevelt, no less than Mr. Gompers, is denounced because he ventures to express an opinion of his own regarding certain adjudications. Now both may be wrong in their criticisms but it does not follow that criticism is wrong. If so, then the courts themselves must be guilty of the same wrong, for they criticise one another. And every member of our Supreme Court itself must often thus do wrong, for every one of them has often dissented from the decisions of the majority. And Abraham Lincoln must have been wrong, for his criticisms of the Supreme Court makes Mr. Roosevelt's sound tame. And history itself must be wrong, for it now sanctions Lincoln's criticisms of the Dred Scott decision. The truth is that a judicial decision is usually something more than a declaration of the law; it is a declaration of how the law applies to facts. Granting that the judges are the best judges of the law, it is still true that the sociologist, the legislator, the labor leader, or even the "man on the street," may be a better

judge of the facts to which the law is applied. Hence the laboring man is not necessarily presumptous when he makes a calm and candid appeal from the courts to public opinion. To claim infallibility for the courts is no less than political superstition. The courts make no such claim for themselves. Indeed it is a Justice of the Supreme Court of New York who has lately written the following remarkable words: "Confidence in our courts does not require that their decisions on economic questions shall be regarded as binding rules of political conduct on such questions. . . . So long as our courts exercise this power to pass upon the constitutionality of statutes which reflect legislative policy on matters affecting the common good, so long will the principles of government underlying their decisions in such cases be subject to debate." [17]

Such is labor's complaint against the social order, with this added,—the under-valuation of human life by a world that over-values gold and gain. Nor can it be dismissed by saying that the labor-movement itself is only a manifestation of greed, the sordid envy of "the have-nots" for "the haves." For the demand for higher wages and shorter hours simply voices the demand for justice, and this it is that gives moral authority to the labor-movement.

[17] See "The Outlook," March 4, 1911, p. 489.

Nor can we silence labor's complaint by saying that it is the best paid labor which complains the most. This cynical commonplace has its reproof in the words of Thomas Carlyle: "No doubt of it. The best paid workmen are they alone that can so complain! How shall he, the handloomweaver, who in the day that is passing over him has to find food for the day, strike work? If he strike work, he starves within the week. He is past complaint! The fact itself, however, is one which, if we consider it, leads us into still deeper regions of the malady. . . . It is not what a man has outwardly or wants that constitutes the happiness or misery of him. . . . It is the feeling of injustice that is insupportable to all men. . . . No man can bear it, or ought to bear it. A deeper law than any parchment-law whatsoever, a law written direct by the hand of God in the inmost being of man, incessantly protests against it. What is injustice? Another name for disorder, for unveracity, unreality, a thing which veracious created Nature, even because it is not Chaos and a waste-whirling baseless Phantasm, rejects and disowns. It is not the outward pain of injustice; that, were it even the flaying of the back with knotted scourges, the severing of the head with guillotines, is comparatively a small matter. The real smart is the soul's pain and

stigma, the hurt inflicted on the moral self. The rudest clown must draw himself up into an attitude of battle, and resistance to the death, if such be offered him. He cannot live under it; his own soul aloud, and all the universe, with silent continual beckonings, says 'It cannot be.' " [18] Thus the labor problem is more than a sordid conflict between "the haves and the have-nots." Its concern is with the rights of men and therefore with the will of God. And with a great poet of modern Christendom we may well believe that the Christ sees and cares:

"O Nazareth Carpenter who curst
The pride and avarice of thy day,
We would observe thy birth, but first
Thy Sermon on the Mount obey.

"If thou shouldst come once more to men
In this, thy later promised land,
Would not Thy great heart break again
To find these wrongs on every hand.

"Labor, heart-smitten, left to die,
Beneath the feet of Conquest hurled,
Or, lifting Hatred's torch on high,
Wreaking revenge upon the world."

[18] "Chartism": Chapters IV and V.

V

THE CHEAPNESS OF HUMAN LIFE

Labor's gravest charge against our economic system is the under-appraisement of human life. Business proceeds too largely on the assumption that money is worth more than men.

It is reliably estimated that 30,000 wage-earners are killed annually by industrial accidents and 500,000 seriously injured;[1] that there are over 13,000,000 cases of sickness each year among industrial workers and 50,000 deaths from industrial diseases; that at least one-third of this suffering and mortality is preventable; that the pecuniary loss to the laboring class from these causes is at least three-quarters of a billion dollars annually.[2] It was a startling coincidence that during three years of the Boer War the number of British soldiers killed was almost an exact equation with the number killed on American railways during the same three

[1] Bulletin of the U. S. Bureau of Labor, 1906.

[2] "The American Labor Legislation Review," Jan., 1911, p. 127, and "The Prevention of Industrial Accidents," pp. 1 and 2, published by the Fidelity and Casualty Company of New York.

years.[3] In the United States in 1909 nine railway employees were killed every twenty-four hours and one either killed or injured every seven minutes.[4] "At the present rate it would take only seventeen years to kill or injure all the railway employees on the rolls." [5] Or what could be more startling than the fact that the number of lives sacrificed to the industries of the United States during the last four years is about the same as the number killed in battle during the four years of the Civil War? It is also a tragic record that among the employees of at least ten of the leading industries of the United States from one-third to one-half the deaths were due to tuberculosis and that one-third to two-fifths of these fatal cases of tuberculosis were fairly attributable to the character of the employment. In other words, taking account of only a single disease and of no accidents, these industries are chargeable with eleven to twenty per cent. of all deaths among their employees.[6] Still more tragic are the records of certain great insurance companies showing that the average death-rate among working-

[3] J. G. Brooks: "The Social Unrest," p. 210.

[4] D. L. Cease in "The American Labor Legislation Review," Jan., 1911, p. 43.

[5] *McClure's Magazine*, June, 1910, p. 165.

[6] Publication No. 10 of the American Association for Labor Legislation.

men at their most productive age—25 to 35 years—is nearly twice as great as the death rate among men engaged in other than manual occupations.[7]

We must remember that this is more than a matter of dry statistics. Back of the statistics are human beings. An "industrial accident" does not mean merely that another unit is to be added to a column of figures. It means the "agony of the crushed arm or the anguished leap of the workman's nerve under the boiling metal." It means the rush of the ambulance, the carnage of the operating table, the long nights of burning thirst and infernal delirium in the hospital. It means the asylum or the almshouse. Nor is an "occupational disease" just a medical classification. It means, for instance, "phossy jaw," a horror so loathsome that experienced surgeons sometimes faint while treating it, so persistent that sometimes life can be saved only by amputation of the victim's jaw, leaving him a life worse than death. In one form or another some human tragedy is represented by every unit in these thousands and millions of industrial casualties and diseases. Not war alone, but work sometimes, is hell.

Labor demands justice, not pity. For these tragedies of our industrial warfare, while due

[7] Louis D. Brandeis in "The Outlook," June 10, 1911, p. 293.

in some cases to the fact that they are unavoidable, are due in many cases to the fact that it would cost money to avoid them. Phosphorus necrosis, the culminating horror of occupational diseases, is due solely to an economy of five per cent. in the manufacture of matches. On one of our great railroads the casualties in 1906 were 2097. The next year the road's traffic had greatly increased in all respects, ton-mileage, passenger-mileage, train-mileage, and car-mileage, and yet the casualties had diminished to 1209 as the result of an effective system of block signals and safety appliances installed that year.[8] In the year 1911 the Chicago and Northwestern Railroad put into operation a thorough system of safety appliances and regulations resulting in the reduction of fatal accidents among several classes of employees in the following percentages: train-men 50 per cent., switchmen 40 per cent., station-men 50 per cent., car-repairers and inspectors 85 per cent.[9] From such data it is no strained inferencce that at least one-third of our railroad accidents has been attributable to the homicidal parsimony which would not pay for the available safeguards. In the coal mines of the United States

[8] See *The Saturday Evening Post,* July 25, 1908, article, "The Carnage of Peace."

[9] See "The Northwestern Christian Advocate," Jan. 10, 1912.

30,000 men have been killed during the last twenty years, and while we have neglected the methods of prevention and rescue in general use in Europe, the annual death-rate of the coal regions has been steadily rising here and steadily declining there. Mills and machines afford the same evidence. Broken belts cause many of our cruelest accidents. Yet belts can be protected. The bursting of over-pressed boilers in 1905 caused 385 deaths and 505 injuries in this country; largely a needless carnage, as appears from the fact that Great Britain compels precautions which have kept the number of like casualties there at the low average of 28 deaths and 60 injuries per annum during a period of twenty years.[11] In the year 1906 in factories of one state a hundred men were killed, or crippled for life, by one little shop-device called the set-screw.[12] "The set-screw stands up from the surface of the rapidly revolving shafts and, as it turns, catches dangerously at hands and clothes. For thirty-five cents this danger-device could be recast into a safety-device." Thus from all ranges of industry come the damning evi-

[11] *The Saturday Evening Post,* loc. cit.

[12] E. T. Davis, State Factory Inspector of Illinois, quoted by W. Hard in "Injured in Course of Duty." See also "The Prevention of Industrial Accidents," p. 185. (Published by the Fidelity and Casualty Co. of N. Y).

dences of our national greed. Labor's demand for legal protection to life and limb is a demand for the most elementary justice.

Adequate justice would consist in the prevention of these evils. So far as this proves impracticable, the minimum of justice would then be assured compensation. Yet the truth is that the doctrines of our courts as to contributory negligence, the negligence of fellow-servants, and the assumption of risks, are such that compensation is the exception rather than the rule. It is estimated "that not one in eleven injured workmen sues, and of those who sue not one in ten recovers." If our industries must consume arms, legs, lungs and lives, why shouldn't we pay for them? There is moral authority hardly less than prophetic in the demands which a modern journalist thus puts to the social conscience: "Shall the laborer really donate that arm to us, or shall not we, refusing to live on lost arms, return to him the mere, but exact, commercial value of the loss he has sustained? Why shouldn't every industry carry the burden of its own killed and wounded? Why shouldn't compensation for disability be just as much a cost of the business as it is of the cost of war? Why shouldn't the industrial soldier, meeting his death in forms as terrible as those of any battle-field, die knowing that he will leave, if

not glory, at least a few years' food to his family? Why shouldn't society, having invented machines which make business one long war, treat the enlisted men at least like enlisted men and, if they are incapacitated, assign them temporarily or permanently, to the rank and pay of pensioners of peace?" [13] And it seems about time that Emerson's prophecy should come true: "When it is presented to the American people, I believe they will say it is just as fair to charge up every year the depreciation in men as it is to charge up the depreciation in machinery and buildings." [14]

These considerations call for the enactment of the following program. (1) The radical modification of the common-law defenses against employers' liability. (2) The establishment of governmental institutions for the invention of safety and sanitary devices, and for the scientific study, prevention and treatment of occupational diseases. (3) Laws enforcing the use of every approved safety-mechanism and sanitary provision in industry. (4) Laws insuring equitable, immediate and certain compensation to all victims of industrial casualty and disease, or their families. The latter measure would be doubly

[13] W. Hard, op. cit.
[14] Essay on Compensation.

efficacious. Beside affording effective relief to actual sufferers, it would also reduce such suffering to the minimum; for when it must all be paid for in full, then it will be found cheaper to employ every safeguard. The equities of this matter are thus summarized by the Bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church in their official address of 1908: "So far as greed makes such things possible the Master whom we serve demands from us the protest of his Church and for the sufferers the tenderest sympathy. The love we owe our brother man warrants and compels us to plead for greater protection against accident and greater mercy and justice, even to care in old age, for the wounded and crippled from the industrial battlefield."

Here, as everywhere, the fear that it will cost too much to do right, is a fear as foolish as it is wicked. The one cost which can be afforded under no circumstances is the present cost in life and limb. Justice to labor involves injustice to no one. There would be no injustice to employers. The cost of such compensation would be shifted from the employers to society at large. Like any other expense common to all who are conducting a given industry, this expense also enters into the costs of production and is finally paid by the public as an element in price. In other words, it is

essentially an indirect tax to be paid by the consumer.

Yet even to the public at large, workingmen's compensation would cost little or nothing in the end. For the immediate expense would be ultimately balanced by several economies. First of all, a large proportion of the present number of injuries, illnesses, and deaths would then be averted by improved preventive measures. In consequence of this happy result there would follow ultimately a great reduction in present expenses of liability-insurance and damage-suits, with immediate saving to industry and ultimate saving to the public. Furthermore, public charities would be relieved of enormous charges made upon them for the support of the thousands now reduced to dependency through our dangerous and unsanitary industries. In Chicago it was ascertained that 109 out of 1000 cases of destitution were due in whole or in part to some kind of industrial accident. Again, the industrial efficiency and social worth of thousands would become an increasing asset to society through coming generations as the result of the abolition of the woman-labor, child-labor, dependency and delinquency of which our present system of non-compensation is a prolific source.

Nor is there any grave danger that such

laws may drive away industries from the states which enact them to others which do not. As we have just seen, industry would thus be put to little, if any, net expense. Furthermore, actual experience shows that other labor laws, even when involving much immediate expense, have not driven away industries from the states enacting them.[15] In this regard it is hardly less than decisive that the German Empire, subject to strict and comprehensive compensation and insurance laws, has yet been conspicuous in its recent industrial development in spite of the competition of the world. Furthermore, our American states are carefully forestalling the difficulty in question, first, by tentatively regulating the scale of legal compensation with regard to the admitted wastefulness of the present system and the probable economics of the new system; second, by co-operative legislation, framed and enacted after conference of the representatives of the several states, or by directly copying one another's enactments.

Christian men of to-day must remember the Priest and the Levite of old who passed by on the other side,—possibly not so much heartless as busy men, probably engaged just then in "church-work." And while these churchmen hurried on unheeding, the great work of

[15] See G. L. Bolen: "Getting a Living," p. 597.

the Church was left to a despised "outsider," who did it well. To-day humanity lies plundered and bleeding by the highway. God forbid that we should pass by on the other side.

VI

WHAT CHURCH-MEN SHOULD KNOW ABOUT THE LABOR UNIONS

The most noteworthy criticism of the labor unions ever published is probably the recent work of President Eliot entitled, "The Future of Trade-Unionism and Capitalism in a Democracy." And yet President Eliot concedes therein that "the efforts which trade-unions have made to improve the conditions of employment in all the chief industries which support civilized society are so commendable that society at large ought to be patient with the false theories or bad practices which have impaired or counteracted their work." [1] And George L. Bolen, a critic no less severe, characterizes unionism as a "great and noble movement for the upliftment of humanity" with "a long array of achievements that proved as beneficial to society as to its own adherents." [2]

To enumerate some of the achievements for social welfare which command such commenda-

[1] Op. cit., p. 51.
[2] "Getting a Living," pp. 179, 288.

tion from the most uncompromising critics is the purpose of this chapter. For several reasons appreciation seems here and now more timely than criticism. First, because such criticisms are already familiar, perhaps too familiar. Again, because the social situation will be the more profitably discussed, not by apportioning blame, but by awarding honor wherever due and whenever possible. Finally, because it is the right of any institution to be judged by its fixed ideals and net results rather than by its incidental methods and occasional abuses; otherwise, the banking system and monogamous marriage, even the Church and the State, as justly as the labor-union, would stand condemned. We will do well indeed to heed the eloquent counsel of Bishop McIntyre: "Judge the union by its best, not by its worst. Paul cried, with lifted hands in chains, 'Remember my bonds.' He could not do all he would. Labor is beset with bitter conditions. To fling censure is easy, and gelatinous essays concocted from a denatured Bible are useless." [3]

1. *The organization of labor has elevated the general standard of living.*

The standard of living is that degree of

[3] See "The Methodist Review," March, 1912, p. 232.

economic good which a social class is able to maintain as the material basis of its life. "Beyond all controversy, that frightful deterioration of the industrial classes which the large system of industry set in deadly operation has been arrested, and the lot of the laboring man has been vastly improved during the last seventy-five years. . . . No such horrible living conditions can be found to-day in the great factory towns of Great Britain; even the submerged tenth are living far more decently now than the average mechanic was living then. Even Pittsburg, in all its misery, is a paradise compared with Manchester and Glasgow in the third and fourth decades of the nineteenth century. Many causes have wrought together to produce this improvement, but the students of social science agree in their judgment that the most efficient cause of that improvement has been the organization of labor." [4]

This is unionism's noblest social service. More than that, it is the noblest possible service to social welfare. For the workingman's standard of living means nothing else than the effectiveness of his purpose to participate in the civilization and progress of humanity. "The rising standards of living are due to the

[4] Washington Gladden in "The Outlook," March 4, 1911, p. 502.

ideal which religion has taught us all to have of manhood and womanhood, wifehood and childhood." [5] The sociology of the times seems unanimous in the view that only as the standard of living rises can civilized society be saved from the alternative disasters of general overpopulation on the one hand and the outpopulating power of inferior stocks on the other. "The rosy glow thrown upon the future by the progress of the industrial arts proves but a false dawn unless the common people acquire new wants and raise the plane upon which they multiply." [6]

2. *The shortening of the labor-day, averaging in modern times at least three hours, is chiefly to the credit of the unions.*

To the workers this is more than an economic gain; it is a spiritual gain. Again, it is more than a gain to the workers; it is a gain to society at large. For it "has doubtless been the main cause of the rise of British and American workmen in efficiency, intelligence, and capable citizenship—the

[5] Graham Taylor in "The Social Application of Religion," p. 101.

[6] E. A. Ross: "The Foundations of Sociology," p. 580, ff.

essential elements of strength in a nation."[7]

3. Organized labor is one of the chief defenses of public health.

Every over-worked and debilitated laborer is a ready transmitter of all the germ-diseases, and the unions, in their successes against excessive hours and over-speeding, have actually been defending health and life for all of us. Their effective campaigns against tuberculosis, with such incidents as their hospital-homes for consumptives and the epoch-making achievements of the cigar-makers' union in greatly reducing the abnormal prevalence of the "white plague" in that industry, is a matter of well-known and honorable record.[8] The sanitary reforms of the New York and Chicago bake-shops, whereby the bread of millions has been cleansed from unspeakable filth and deadly germs, are praiseworthy beyond words to the unions which fought the good fight for all the people.[9] Their relentless crusade against the tenement sweat-shop, the prolific breeding-place of consumption, scarlet fever and diphtheria, has probably saved first and last the lives of thousands who know little and care less about the labor-unions.

[7] G. L. Bolen: "Getting a Living," p. 401 ff. and 746. Cf. The New Encyclopedia of Social Reform, p. 1226.

[8] See C. Stelzle: "The Church and Labor," p. 68-69.

[9] See "The Survey," June 18, 1910, p. 483 ff.

4. The unions afford the chief protection against the exploitation of the labor of women and children.

These abuses really amount to the present exhaustion of the future assets of society. And thus the labor union not only strives chivalrously for woman and child; it strives thus for the rights of posterity and even the possible permanency of civilization.[10]

5. Unionism is a safeguard against unemployment and its social ill-consequences.

By their service as employment bureaus, and again by their "out-of-work" benefits, the unions seem to render more effective service than any other agencies for the like purpose.

6. The benefit funds of the unions are among the great benevolences of the age.

Nearly all pay burial expenses of members and some provide homes or pensions for the aged and ill. In one year the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers paid $800,000 in death and accident benefits,[11] and the unions affiliated with the American Federation of Labor more than four and a half millions in

[10] See "Social Ministry," (edited by H. F. Ward) p. 158; C. Stelzle: "The Church and Labor," p. 82; G. L. Bolen: "Getting a Living," p. 479.

[11] G. L. Bolen, op. cit., pp. 173-174.

benefits of all kinds.[12] "The members of old unions seldom appear on the lists of recipients of alms and trade-unionism has come to be one of the chief bulwarks against pauperism."[13]

7. Unionism often protects employers against unscrupulous competitors.

In every industry there is likely to be a number of unprincipled competitors who, though usually a minority, are able to "flood the market" with cheap goods produced by under-paid or over-worked labor, sometimes driving their more conscientious competitors out of business. Their attitude menaces alike the interests of the other employers and all the employees in the trade concerned, and the trade-unions, by exacting just and humane terms from the unscrupulous, are the effective champions, not only of the employees, but of the better and the greater number of the employers as well.[14] Historic examples are afforded by the strike of the New York garment-workers in 1904,[15] the bake-shop regulations of 1910 in the same city,[16] the unionizing of the Illinois coal-miners in 1897,[17] and very

[12] W. A. White in "The Old Order Changeth."

[13] C. R. Henderson: "Social Elements," p. 179; Cf. C. Stelzle: "The Church and Labor," pp. 68-70.

[14] See J. G. Brooks: "The Social Unrest," p. 15.

[15] See *McClure's Magazine,* December, 1904, p. 138.

[16] "The Survey," June 18, 1910, p. 483 ff.

[17] G. L. Bolen: "Getting a Living," p. 731.

impressively on the occasion when the ribbon manufacturers of Coventry contributed £16,000 to assist the weavers' union in holding other competing employers to the union scale of wages.[18]

Unionism further benefits employers by increasing the efficiency of labor and consequently by increasing the quantity and improving the quality of the out-put. In spite of the undeniable tendencies of rabid unionism to the contrary, union men usually know that in order to maintain they must also earn a high rate of wages; that employers cannot in the long run pay more than it pays to pay. If the better terms of employment procured through the unions prove permanent, that is, if they do not thus exhaust the capital that affords employment, then it is evident that "the rise in the standard of living has been accompanied by at least an equal rise in the standard of working." The pressure of unionism for higher wages also tends to the extended use of machinery and to the improvement of technical processes and industrial organization, while these results in turn require ever-increasing efficiency on the part of the individual worker. It is to be noted that these benefits accrue not only to employees and their employers, but ultimately to the public as well.

[18] G. L. Bolen: "Getting a Living," p. 182.

8. Trade-unionism is a main factor in popular education.

As declared by the resolutions of the Federal Council of Churches: "By them (the unions) society at large is benefited . . . in the educational influence of the multitudes who in the labor unions find their chief, sometimes their only, intellectual stimulus."

Unionism has been the chief educator of the co-operative man. The actual successes of the unions depend on the degree in which they develop in their members the co-operative virtues of fraternity, patience, discipline, "teamwork," self-sacrifice and the collective exercise of sound judgment. As Shailer Mathews declares: "There is many a church which in point of general altruism and loyalty to its professions of high purpose, could not endure a comparison with the work of some labor unions." [19] Hence it is no surprise to discover that co-operative enterprises flourish where trade-unionism has flourished and rarely anywhere else.[20]

In other ways also unionism has been an effective school of citizenship. By their continual agitation for labor legislation, the unionists are compelled to think out a political program

[19] "The Church and the Changing Order," p. 125.
[20] See G. L. Bolen: "Getting a Living," pp. 88-89.

which not only pleases themselves but will please the public sufficiently to procure its legal enactment and enforcement, and in so doing they must acquaint and relate themselves with the political institutions and conditions of the country.

Again, their successes in procuring a humane degree of leisure and a living wage make possible for the working classes the "time and strength and spirit to think" without which good citizenship is impossible,—for it is evident that most men, if compelled to work twelve hours or more every day of the week and to live on meager supplies of the mere animal necessities, are likely to become either animals or anarchists in the end. Thus the union has promoted popular knowledge of politics, economics and the social sciences. Its members, in attending to the union's affairs, to its large financial interests, to its general social policies, have been trained in business efficiency. It has taught them how to bargain for their wages, "perhaps the most useful to them of all earthly knowledge." In short, it has been the great popular teacher of "associated self-help, the main force in public movements." Such considerations fairly warrant the saying of William E. Gladstone that "trade unions are the bulwarks of modern democracies" [21] and

[21] Quoted by G. L. Bolen: "Getting a Living," p. 191.

Lyman Abbott's that "by training in habits of co-operation and combination unionism has laid the foundation of future perfected social democracy." [22]

9. The union is the greatest influence for the Americanizing of the immigrant, save only the public school.

After enumerating certain particulars, Carroll D. Wright declares: "It is doubtful if any other organization than a trade-union could accomplish these things. . . . Certain it is that no other organization is attempting to do this, at least not by amalgamation, which is the only way assimilation can be secured among the foreign elements." [23] Mr. Wright further points out that it is through the union that the immigrant most often hears that he is not the victim of but a partner in our government and must do his part in making the partnership beneficial to all.

10. Unionism is an influence for law and order.

It is true that the unions are not often thought of in this character and too often appear in the contrary character. Nevertheless this very claim in their behalf can be established

[22] See "The Outlook," August 20, 1911, p. 881.

[23] U. S. Bureau of Labor, Bulletin No. 56, January, 1905.

on good grounds. There are few, if any, laws on the statute-books more important to the public welfare than those relating to the industrial employment of women and children, sweat-shop and tenement conditions, industrial safety and sanitation, and the observance of Sunday in industry and commerce. And it is well-known that the enforcement of these and kindred forms of social legislation, has its chief security in the unremitting vigilance of the labor unions.[24]

With regard to the industrial conflicts in which the unions engage, the disorders with which they are too often charged should in justice be offset by the active support of the law with which they are not often enough accorded their due credit. "For example, when funerals were picketed in Chicago the grewsome fact was heralded throughout the land. But when a little later in the same city, a local union fined one of its members for assaulting a non-union workman and furnished the witnesses to secure his conviction in a criminal court, the incident received only passing local attention and elsewhere was ignored. Again, when a union at Schenectady that had fallen under socialistic influence, expelled a member because he belonged to the militia, the widely published statement evoked severe and sweeping

[24] Cf. "The Survey," June 18, 1910, p. 488.

criticisms of an attitude which was ascribed to unionism in general. But when, soon afterwards, the annual convention of garment workers by a large majority declared its support of the militia, or when Mr. Gompers, in a trenchant article, defended the militia, daily journalism took no notice of the fact." [25]

A well known Boston capitalist reminds us that "from the beginning labor has had to fight the enemy not only from without but from within as well, and this because, from the very nature of its cause, it has had to take in all kinds of working people, no matter whether they were fit or not."[26] As an inevitable result of this inevitable condition the reckless revolutionary element sometimes comes to the front and the top in the unions. But we must remember that this is not the rule but the exception. For in the unions, as everywhere, the men with cool heads and steady nerves tend to assume their natural leadership, and such men well know that the interests of the union, as well as their own continued leadership, demand that the hot-heads and the fire-eaters be effectually restrained. Much current criticism of the unions seems to ignore the fact that the

[25] Report of the Executive Council of the National Civic Federation quoted by Adams and Sumner, Labor Problems, p. 211n.

[26] See "The Survey," Dec. 30, 1911, p. 1418.

same disorderly and desperate men would still exist even if there were no unions, and without the unions would be far more dangerous than they are within the unions where they are associated with the wiser and better men who are usually in the majority. This noiseless but pervasive restraint is more effective than that of the police because it comes closer home. Sometimes, indeed, this restraint proves ineffectual, arson, dynamiting, or street-rioting ensues, the newspapers publish the horror, and we all know all about it. But at most times it is effectual, the newspapers publish nothing and the rest of us know nothing about it. When a million men merely behave themselves and compel their associates to do the same, that does not make a "story" for the papers, but one McNamara with a stick of dynamite always does. Without his union and the hope it begets, the wage-earner, given over to the mad anger of despair, would usually become a terrible recruit to the ever-swelling ranks of anarchy. "Take this fresh hope of better days through unionism from him and I would tremble for the commonwealth," writes Bishop McIntyre; "let no black prejudice spawned in the dark ages choke down the lid on this safety-valve of aspiration lest the ship of state be imperilled." [27]

[27] See the Methodist Review, March, 1912, p. 228.

11. Organized labor is an influence for temperance.

Unionism makes for a higher standard of living. A higher standard of living in turn means better homes. And good homes are the sovereign remedy for saloons. For similar reasons, the shortening of the work-day, due chiefly to unionism, has generally promoted temperate habits among workers.[28] The Knights of Labor have always refused membership to employees of the liquor business. The stereotypers' union of New York fines members who come on duty drunk. The Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers requires total abstinence of its members and all the railway brotherhoods are rigid in their temperance regulations.[29] In Great Britain there is a temperance society composed exclusively of walking delegates and other union officials, its object being "the promotion of total abstinence and the removal of trades' society meetings from licensed premises." Nearly every labor-member of Parliament belongs to it.[30] A similar movement is now under way among labor leaders in this country and has promise of much influence and usefulness. In spite of the affiliation of the bar-tenders' union with the

[28] See G. L. Bolen: "Getting a Living," p. 412.
[29] See G. L. Bolen, op. cit., p. 189, 297.
[30] See C. Stelzle: "The Church and Labor," p. 76 ff.

American Federation of Labor, the national officers of the latter have pronounced themselves strongly against the saloon and are systematically endeavoring to procure for unions everywhere meeting places other than saloon-premises. The Federation in a recent national convention has refused to go on record against marked activity in no-license campaigns of its General Treasurer, Mr. John B. Lennon.

12. Organized labor is a chief influence for international peace.

Its adherents are everywhere well aware that the intolerable burdens of war and armament fall chiefly upon the working classes. An English authority reports that "in Europe the general hope for peace is centered in the work done by labor organizations," adding, "we hope that as soon as these organizations achieve their efficiency, they will organize themselves into international bodies to prevent war."[31] And hardly less than prophetic is Keir Hardie's prediction of "the time when an organized working class would take its place in the politics of the world by declaring that on the day on which a war was declared tools would be dropped and every wheel

[31] Harold Gorst, quoted in "The Christian Ministry and the Social Order," p. 293.

stopped in every country affected by the war."[32]

13. Unionism is to be credited with some religious spirit.

As it raises the standard of living, it sets men free from bondage to material things and so makes possible for them the things of the spirit. Labor, although estranged from the Church, is yet manifestly responsive to fraternal overtures from the Church. Best of all, workingmen everywhere revere the name and the lordship of Jesus.

Surely organized labor has a long and honorable record of service rendered to the general welfare of mankind. By essential facts and forces such as these, not by questionable or even deplorable incidents, must Christian men appraise the labor movement and pronounce it a prime factor in progressive civilization.

[32] See "The Outlook," February 11, 1911, p. 325.

VII

WHAT WAGE-EARNERS SHOULD KNOW ABOUT THE CHURCH

"How can I hate him? I know him," said Charles Lamb. Better acquaintance is the way to good will. When church-men get better acquainted with the labor unions, and laboring-men with the churches, mutual esteem and fraternal co-operation, to the benefit of both, will ensue. And in the long run a benefit greater still will accrue to society at large.

What churchmen should know about the labor unions, was the subject of the preceding chapter. It is now in order to consider, What laboring-men ought to know about the Church. If the reader is a laboring man, he is challenged to give the Church a square deal. If he is a churchman, he is charged to present the claims of the Church to laboring men and their unions whenever a hearing can be obtained.

1. *The church has created the moral sentiment to which labor appeals and by which social service subsists.*

It is true that nearly all the gains of the

labor movement have been made on demand of the labor unions rather than of the churches. It is equally true that such demands would never have been accorded, nor even heard, apart from the social conscience which the churches have created. The unions have been able to do for the masses in America what could not have been done in any heathen country simply because we have churches in America. In the pre-Christian world the highest social thought was attained by Plato and Aristotle. Here is Plato's best word concerning labor: "Nature has made neither bootmakers nor blacksmiths; such occupations degrade the people engaged in them, miserable mercenaries excluded by their very position from political rights." And here is Aristotle's: "In the state which is best governed the citizens must not lead the life of mechanics or tradesmen, for such a life is ignoble and inimical to virtue." [1] The difference between the world of that and the world of this day simply registers the fact that in the meantime the Church has had its word to say. As Professor Ely writes: "Apart from Christ the natural tendency is to come back to the standpoint of the Greeks and despise the masses." [2] And Professor Ross says: "What keeps the Church most alive

[1] See G. Hodges: "Faith and Social Service," p. 58.
[2] See G. L. Bolen: "Getting a Living," p. 648.

is its power to fit human beings for harmonious social life. It is, in the last analysis, the repository of certain related ideas, convictions, symbols, and appeals which have more efficacy in socializing the human heart than any other group of influences known to Western Civilization." [3] And Professor Dewey says: "The highest product of the interest of man in man is the Church." [4]

2. The church through the course of history has always been a main factor in the upliftment of the masses.

What is the most democratic fact of history? Not a primitive folk-moot in a North German forest, nor the red-handed Jacquerie of France, nor Napoleon crowned as the people's Emperor, but the fact that a Carpenter is worshiped as God by the nations of the earth, and this is the achievement of the Church. And the teaching of the Carpenter, perpetuated by the Church, is everywhere recognized as the divine charter for the worth and rights of the common people.

The greatest single institution in the interest of labor is the weekly rest day "secured for the toilers of Christendom by the very charter of the Church and defended on their behalf by

[3] See "The Outlook," August 28, 1897.
[4] "Psychology," p. 343.

it through the centuries,"—the earliest, most enduring, and most beneficent labor legislation known to history. "The Sabbath stood for the idea that man belonged to God, and that the lowliest man should be a man of leisure on that day, owing his time to nobody but God. The Council of Wessex (691 A. D.) legislated that if a slave was forced by his master to work on the Sabbath, he was to be free. The slave is God's man on that day; and God warns the mighty not to trespass on his domain."[5]

Again it is never to be forgotten that the great stream of philanthropy, which partly compensates the inequalities of society, has its perennial source in the influence of the Church. And not only the impulse to help the less favored, but likewise the upward aspirations of the less favored themselves have arisen from the same inexhaustible source. In the words of Graham Taylor: "The Christian evangel has long held the ideal overhead and the dynamic within the heart which has inspired a divine discontent. Every now and then the gospel strikes the earth under the feet of the common man, and he rises up to be counted as one." [6] All great movements for popular welfare are typified, as to their essential character, by such popular uprisings as those of the

[5] H. L. Nash: "The Genesis of the Social Conscience."
[6] See "The Social Application of Religion," pp. 93-94.

German peasantry in the sixteenth century and of the laborers of England following the ministry of John Wycliffe, both of which asserted the rights of the masses in terms of the gospel which came to them through the Church. To reply that the organized Church does not immediately and everywhere enlist itself in such movements, is only to cite the irrelevant fact that whenever truth is newly discovered it is not discovered by everybody all at once; there must always be seers and pioneers. And the Church does infinitely more for the masses than any other institution, even should we admit that it does no more than perpetuate the sources from which alone the seers and pioneers of humanity must ever renew their vision and their strength.

The abolition of slavery was the greatest of all labor movements. And the common scoff that the Church did not abolish slavery misses its point. The Golden Rule abolished slavery. And the Church has carried the Golden Rule down the centuries and around the world. According to an authority so impartial as Benjamin Kidd, slavery was abolished in Europe, where formerly universal, largely through the quiet and all but forgotten persuasions of priests and prelates in the middle ages.[7] And Carroll D. Wright attributes its final abolition

[7] See "Western Civilization."

throughout the British Empire to the unmistakable influence of the Wesleyan revival.[8] It is well-known that the emancipation-crusade of William Wilberforce was the direct consequence of his evangelical conversion.[9]

3. Laboring men should take account of the social movement in the Church to-day.

Nothing is at present so engaging the heart and the hands of the Church. It is too true that the Church has done far less than it ought for the social welfare in general and for labor in particular; but it is also true that no critics of the Church are more unsparing in this regard than those of its own membership. And the Church at large, so far from being hostile, or even indifferent to such criticism, welcomes and lays it to heart. When an institution regularly generates and responds to self-criticism it manifests a prime qualification of social fitness and survival. The response of the Church to social needs is evidenced in the departments of labor and social service authorized by nearly all of the denominations, the observance of Labor Sunday and the identification of many ministers with the unions or their interests, the increasing concern of the churches for labor-legislation, the official dec-

[8] See G. L. Bolen: "Getting a Living," p. 649.
[9] See Encyclopædia Britannica, Art. "Wilberforce."

larations of the chief denominations committing them to the labor movement, and especially the like declaration of the Federal Council of the Churches and the work of its Social Service Commission, whereby the Protestantism of America is committed with authority to a social creed and a social program. Beyond all this, it is to be remembered that the larger part of the social work of the Church is that which its members are doing as individuals in pursuance of its teachings. The help which the Church renders the cause of labor is not measured by the visible activity of its organization or officials, but by the degree in which all who render any service are actuated by the Christian spirit and motives which the Church inculcates.

When laboring men complain that our resolutions and sermons are "mere talk" and that the churches ought to "do something," their complaint is a mingling of wisdom with unwisdom. We may properly require them to observe that "talk" in the sense of instruction, reproof and persuasion, is not to be disparaged; that in this sense it is at once the chief function of the Church and a chief force in all human affairs, in labor unions for instance; that the right kind of "talking" is "doing." Again they should consider that the Church must never do more than persuade men; that its attempt to coerce men has been its greatest

historic error. Yet we cannot demand that such critics be entirely satisfied with the Church. Our preachings and resolutions, our teachings and testimony, ought to be more timely, more practical, more human, more prophetic. As organizations the churches ought to "talk," not less but better, and also "do" many more things than now. But when all is said and done, the talking will have led to the doing.

4. Laboring men should not under-estimate the democratic constituency and spirit of the church.

The Church is still essentially the Church of the people. I speak of the rule, not the exception. There are exceptions,—a few city churches which are conspicuous because exceptional, and exceptional because so few in comparison to the tens of thousands of humble churches composed of humble people.

It is true that the operations of the Church are so extended and complicated as to require business ability of the highest order and financial resources in large amounts. Nevertheless the attempts of "big business" and "big money" to take advantage of these requirements are apparently infrequent and in certain instances the repudiation of such attempts has been sharp and conclusive. The

great business enterprises of the churches are largely conducted by men who have come from humble stations in life and are now rendering great services at small salaries. And the expenses are paid, not chiefly by the few large gifts of the rich, but by the many small gifts of the poor. Nor are all the great churches in great cities dominated by "predatory wealth." Among the most eminent champions of labor and of social reform are some of the distinguished city pastors of every denomination.

5. *Laborers should recognize the free ministration and open fellowship of the churches.*

In an earlier chapter it was frankly acknowledged that snobbery is the manifest sin of some churches. Nevertheless I know of more than a few churches where this suspicion is due to misunderstanding entirely. Let laborers who demand justice for themselves be sure to accord it to the Church.

It ought to be more generally recognized that the Church is the one great social institution sustained at great expense by voluntary gifts and offering its ministrations without charge to all the people. Furthermore, "unlike the fraternal orders, with which it is unfavorably compared, the Church welcomes all grades of people, not having the black-ball

method of restricting membership." Therefore church-men may rightly address wage-earners in this wise: The Church needs you. You need the Church. Meantime if you are not entirely pleased with the Church, remember that the Church isn't entirely pleased with itself. Don't grumble, but lend a hand. There are enough of you to make the Church whatever you want it to be, and you can take possession any day you please. The door to membership is open,—why not all come in at once,—in the fear of God, seeking pardon for sin, justice for society, fellowship with humanity? What a vision!

VIII

THE SOCIAL CREED OF THE CHURCH

In 1908 the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ, officially representing thirty-three denominations of American Protestantism, promulgated a declaration which has been generally received as "the social creed of the Church." It should be distinctly recognized that this august body was commissioned with authority competent to commit to its utterances the participating denominations collectively. But further, the same denominations, by their own official utterances, have committed themselves severally to the same principles. For the historic declaration of the Federal Council was preceded by an almost identical utterance of the Methodist Episcopal Church and was followed by equivalent utterances on the part of nearly all the Protestant denominations. With a view to defining the position of the Church as to the labor movement, I will now quote in order, commenting on each, the social principles for which, by their own avowal, "the churches must stand."

1. *"For equal rights and complete justice for all men in all stations of life."*

Here is a two-fold demand, namely, for equality and for justice, each in the Christian sense. When Christ taught all men, without respect of person, to say "Our Father," He put them on an equal level of worth in relation to God. So far as human relations put men on unequal levels of worth, the social system becomes unchristian and ungodly. "Equal rights for all men in all stations of life" means equality of opportunity, not equality of possessions, and universality of rights, not uniformity of station. Not the equal capacities of all men, but the equal right of all to make the most of their unequal capacities, is asserted. Hence all economic combinations and all social conditions which limit the opportunity of any man or hinder him from realizing any of the proper ends of his being, are contrary to the spirit of Jesus and the law of His kingdom. And social justice, no less than private morality, must be the uncompromising demand of the Church if it is to be worthy of its Master's name.

2. *"For the right of all men to the opportunity for self-maintenance, a right ever to be wisely and strongly safeguarded against encroachments of every kind. For the right of workers to some protection against the hardships often*

resulting from the swift crises of industrial change."

This language seems fairly to commit the Church to the epoch-making doctrine of "the right to labor." We may not be committed to all the alleged implications of that doctrine; to be committed to its admitted implications is sufficiently revolutionary. The right to labor is necessary to the right to live, and should be supported, not by barren permission, but by adequate legal enactments and social institutions. Whether or not the means to this end are now apparent, the end itself should be recognized as a moral imperative and the means should be diligently sought and employed. But "he that will not work, neither shall he eat." Voluntary and involuntary idleness are alike demoralizing. Their abolition should be the accepted work of all Christian nations. Against this principle Goldwin Smith thus argues: "Nor can the right to employment be asserted when no employment offers, in the case of an artisan any more than in that of a lawyer for whom there are no clients, or a physician for whom there are no patients." [1] This assumes wrongly that the artisan's right to employment means the right to earn the special wage-rate incident to his special skill in his trade. The right really claimed is rather the

[1] "Labour and Capital," p. 9.

simple right to a living wage, which belongs unconditionally to the artisan and the professional man alike on the simple ground that they have a right to live, and is a very different matter from the exceptional wage paid for their exceptional abilities, which becomes their right only on condition that somebody promises to pay it.

3. *"For the principal of conciliation and arbitration in industrial dissensions."*

In such dissensions the general public is always a party in interest, sometimes the chief party in interest. The interests of the immediate disputants should ever be amenable to this larger social interest. Hence the public should always reserve, and when necessary exercise, the right to intervene in its own behalf, especially when transportation or other public services, or such necessities of life as fuel or foodstuffs, are involved, and whenever public peace and order are menaced. While such intervention should be primarily conciliatory and persuasive, yet in defense of public interests it should be potentially decisive on occasions of great social emergency.

4. *"For the protection of the worker from dangerous machinery, occupational disease, injuries and mortality."*

An earlier chapter has been given to this

subject. The following conclusions may be here re-stated. The prevention of these evils should be secured by every available precaution and safeguard. When not preventable, they should be regarded as incidental to the economic progress of society, and as such should be borne, as far as possible, by society at large rather than by the wage-earner, his family, or his social class. With a view to prevention and compensation alike, the Church and Christian men should earnestly promote the due reformation of industrial processes and customs and the enactment of effective legislation in this regard. This course is called for not only in justice to the working class, but in defense of the social interests which now suffer through the disintegration of family life, the untimely labor of children and women, the incapacity and consequent pauperism, and the race degeneracy, all so largely due to the needless or uncompensated accidents and diseases of modern industry.

5. "For the abolition of child-labor."

The sacred rights of childhood are the rights to home, health, play and education. Christian citizens are therefore called upon to use all influences for the enactment and enforcement of laws that will prevent the employment of children at an undue age, during excessive

hours or under any condition detrimental to health, happiness, efficiency or character. Every state should also maintain a system of free, compulsory and adequate education, such system being so co-ordinated with the code affecting child-labor that their operation shall be mutually supplementary and together secure childhood from ignorance on the one hand and habitual idleness on the other. Thus the interests of childhood, of labor, of the common wealth and of posterity will be alike conserved.

6. *"For such regulation of the condition of labor for women as shall safeguard the physical and moral health of the community."*

The Supreme Court of the United States has lately declared that such regulation should be "imposed not solely for her benefit but also largely for the benefit of all." The health, culture and character of woman, involving her qualification for good motherhood, whether physical, mental or moral, are possibly the most valuable assets of the human race. The industrial employment of women should be limited in respect to the number of working hours per day and the number of working days per month, and in all respects necessary to protect the woman-worker and the social interests involved in her welfare.

7. *"For the suppression of the sweating system."*

Piece-work in the tenement is the prolific source of the miseries, diseases and vices of the city poor. Low wages, long hours, child-labor, abnormal thirst, foul air, organic and inorganic filth, under-feeding, over-crowding, the breeding and broad-casting of tuberculosis, scarlet fever and all manner of germ-diseases; the break-up of the family and the out-break of anarchy, are some of the by-products of the sweating system. The Church ought to be the eager rival of the labor-union in reaching and removing this crime against civilization.

8. *"For the gradual and reasonable reduction of the hours of labor to the lowest practical point, and for that degree of leisure for all which is the condition of the highest human life."*

The reasonable reduction of labor-time is not to be regarded as a concession to indolence but as a contribution to the health, culture and domestic integrity of the masses. The self-respect of civilized communities demands the universal abolition of the twelve-hour day except under pressure of unavoidable emergency. Every successful reduction of the labor-day, when not accompanied by a reduction of wages

or of product, is to be viewed as a social gain.

9. *"For the release from employment one day in seven."*

This demand is sanctioned by physical, economic and divine laws. The Social Service Commission of the Federated Churches has since defined the practical application of this doctrine as follows: "(a) One day of rest for every six days of work; (b) This day of rest, wherever possible, to be made the Lord's Day; (c) The pay of every worker for six days of work to be made sufficient for the needs of seven days of living."

10. *"For a living-wage as a minimum in every industry."*

The living wage cannot be defined in terms of money. Nevertheless it is a definite demand. It is such a wage-rate as will maintain in life and health a family of average number, affording elementary education to the children and due provision for sickness and old age, and not requiring wage-labor on the part of the wife and mother, nor of young children. The social and moral value of a living-wage will be manifest in betterment of family life, sexual morality, public health, industrial efficiency, general culture and good citizenship.

11. "For the highest wage that each industry can afford and for the most equitable division of products of industry that can ultimately be devised."

The common product should be distributed according to the following principles: (1) No man should receive less than a living wage. (2) No man should receive more than he produces or more than a fair equivalent for a service rendered. (3) The general increase of wealth should be accompanied by a proportionate increase of wages. In a Christian society the actual distribution of wealth should be constantly challenged by, and as far as possible governed by, these conditions. To this end industry and commerce must morally and legally be purged of monopoly, exploitation and special privilege.

12. "For suitable provision for the old age of the workers and for those incapacitated by injury."

Old age in almshouse corners flung is a reproach to civilization. In years of strength a man has but the right to *make* a living, but in old age he has a right to a *living*. "Suitable provision for old age" must be accorded to men, not as charity, but justice. This is now more than the testimony of the Church or the clamor of the radical; it is the enacted law of the

world's mightiest empire. And "suitable provision for those incapacitated by injury" is no longer to be contingent on the demonstrable negligence of employers and limited by the costs and uncertainties of litigation, but is to be automatic and assured, presumptively evidenced by the mere fact of the injury, and accorded not as a gratuity but as a right. Since this testimony of the Church was delivered, and we trust in some measure on account of it, eleven American states have embodied its principle in statute law and it is probable that practically all will do so in the early future.

13. "*For the abatement of poverty.*"

When Henry George declared that poverty could and must be abolished there were few to treat him seriously. To-day the charity experts and the sociologists are all but unanimous in the deliberate judgment that involuntary poverty is a preventable evil. The faith of the churches should be no less. True it is said, "the poor ye have always," but not, "*ought* to have." And it is also said, "Seek ye first the kingdom and all these things, (life's material conditions), shall be added unto you." And that promise will yet be literally fulfilled when we seek the kingdom socially as well as individually.

The supreme act of Christian faith in our

generation is the belief that the industrial world can indeed be Christianized and the resolution that it shall be done. That such a faith can be held and make headway amid the regnant selfishness, injustice and cruelty of the times is no less than the modern manifestation of the mind of Christ and the unfading splendor of the Apocalypse. May the men of Christ's Church be not disobedient unto the heavenly vision!

IX

SOCIALISM

The most significant outgrowth of the modern labor movement is Socialism. In its fundamental criticism of the present social order, in its exalted vision of the future social order, and in its living faith in that vision, Socialism ranks next to Christianity itself among the idealisms of history. No study could be more timely, whether for Socialist, Labor-unionist or Christian, than the study of Socialism in its relations with the labor movement and Christianity.

1. SOCIALISM ITSELF

In these days one is likely to be bluntly asked, "Do you believe in Socialism?" The answer is at once as difficult and as easy as though the question had been, "Do you believe in religion?" For just as religion may mean anything from fetichism to "the mind that was in Christ Jesus," so Socialism may mean anything from "the red fool-fury of the Seine" to the Holy City of the Apocalypse. The many and varied Socialisms may be classified under four types. First, Ideal Socialism, which may

mean merely the general prevalence of the social spirit—of fraternity and service. Second, Coöperative Socialism, which seeks all ways to replace competition with coöperation throughout the economic realm.[1] Third, Evolutionary Socialism, which proposes the gradual and experimental extension of state-action, with the complete coöperative commonwealth as the fixed but remote ideal. Fourth, Revolutionary Socialism, which proposes the immediate establishment of the coöperative commonwealth as a substitute for our entire system of competitive industry and private ownership of land and large capital. Revolutionary Socialism is not necessarily a program of disorder and dynamite; its representative programs are strictly political and pacific.

Whether certain of these four types are entitled to the name of Socialism is sometimes denied both by adherents and opponents, and yet all these types have been so named and have so named themselves. To avoid confusion, the present discussion will be confined to the third, the evolutionary type, and without further explanation it may be assumed that the word "Socialism" will be here used with that reference. In this sense it is well defined by the late Edmond Kelley as "the theory that the production, transportation, and distribu-

[1] See T. Kirkup: "History of Socialism," pp. 400-402.

tion of the necessities of life can to a certain extent to-day, slowly to a larger degree, and perhaps eventually altogether, be best undertaken by the collective action of the city or state through the substitution of coöperation for competition, and social for self-interest." [2] Thus we eliminate from the present discussion many points of controversy. In this sense, for instance, Socialism is not artificial nor "contrary to nature," but, as truly as Individualism, is an original factor in nature, as seen in the "collectivism" of the ant-hill and the bee-hive.[3] Nor is such Socialism altogether visionary and untried. It is even now the operative principle of the family, the school and the church, and even in the political state is exemplified by our highways, parks, water-works, postal-system, and all those colossal properties involved in the present conservation problem. It was general in primitive society and generic in primitive Christianity.[4]

Nor does Socialism propose altogether to abolish private property. Goods for consumption would, of course, remain the private property of the consumers. Goods for production, (that is, capital), might be either private or

[2] "Individualism and Collectivism," p. 4.

[3] Cf. E. Kelley: Op. cit., p. 4.

[4] See W. Rauschenbusch: "Christianity and the Social Crisis," pp. 388-393 and 413-414.

common property, according to whether they are for private use or for common use. That is, the carpenter's saw or the artist's pencil might be private property, but a railroad or a factory would be public property. Reasonable Socialists would probably say that a man might properly own any kind of property except such as gives him control over other men's living; property of the latter kind should be owned by all men in common. In a word, the choice is not between Individualism and Socialism as mutually exclusive, but just as Individualism now is largely socialistic, so would Socialism then be largely individualistic.

Socialism also disclaims any menace to the individuality of personal character. It is true indeed that in the lower industrial processes which satisfy those physical needs in which individuals are nearest alike, work would then be done by routine and the workers would be regimented. But this kind of work, according to the socialistic exposition, would thus be reduced to the minimum, and this done, all the workers would still have abundant time and vitality for those higher pursuits in which men exercise their choices and develop their individualities. Says John A. Hobson: "In a word, the highest division of labor has not yet been attained,—that which will apportion machinery to the collective supply of the routine

needs of life, and art to the individual supply of the individual needs. In this way alone can society obtain the full use of the labor-saving character of machinery, minimizing the amount of human exertion engaged in tending machinery and maximizing the amount engaged in the free and interesting occupations." [5] Thus Socialism proposes that individuality shall have for its security, no longer the "special privilege" of the few, but "equality of opportunity" for everyone.

2. SOCIALISM AND THE LABOR MOVEMENT

In its fundamental character the labor movement is more than a strife for higher pay and shorter hours. It is the progress of industrial democracy, and its consummation will come when the economic order, as well as the political government, shall be "of the people, for the people, and by the people." Inasmuch as trade-unionism is a fighting force for obtaining specific economic gains to labor, it can never be adequate to the fulfillment of the labor movement in its higher ideals of universal democracy, justice, fraternity and peace. Socialism is the collective name for these ideals.

Socialists maintain that the laboring-class, no matter how well "unionized," is always at a disadvantage in its present struggle with

[5] "The Evolution of Modern Capitalism."

capital. Hunger forever fights against the class that lives by its labor only, and for the class that lives by capital; for capital is but another name for the opportunity to labor and live. Hence, "Whatever terms organized labor may succeed in winning are always temporary and insecure, like the hold which a wrestler gets on the body of his antagonist. Moreover . . . it has to wrestle on its knees with a foeman who is on his feet." [6] Socialism proposes that no class nor man shall hold such an advantage over others, but that social capital shall be held in common for the common good.

Socialists maintain, again, that trade-unionism is inadequate because it implies the continued division of society into hostile classes,—capitalists and wage-workers. As a war-measure unionism serves the higher ends of the labor movement in the same imperfect way that an efficient army serves the true welfare of a nation. Hence Socialism proposes that all laborers become also capitalists, and all capitalists become laborers, and so that the industrial war shall end in the fusion of the warring classes.

Socialists further maintain that unionism is no remedy for monopoly. The tendency to monopoly is one of the most ominous phe-

[6] W. Rauschenbusch: Op. cit., p. 407.

nomena of the time and the power thus developed is probably the greatest power ever exerted by men over their fellowmen. Were this power to be transferred from the directors of some great corporation to the executive committee of some great labor union, or to be held jointly by both, the interests of society would be no more secure than at present; on the latter supposition probably less so, since the most powerful monopolies even now seem to be those in which there is apparent collusion between the monopolistic management and its unionized employees.[7] Hence Socialism proposes that the whole public be admitted into the combination; in other words that society become its own monopolist.

To set labor free from the advantages of capital in our present industrial war, to end the industrial war itself, to provide that monopoly shall accrue to the public good instead of private gain,—to achieve these ends would at once fulfill the labor movement and inaugurate the socialistic state.

3. SOCIALISM AND CHRISTIANITY

Whatever disagreement may be asserted between Socialism and Christianity, it can hardly be denied that they agree in their motive and in their aim. For the common motive of

[7] Cf. J. A. Hobson: "The Evolution of Modern Capitalism," p. 358.

Christianity and Socialism is conscientious concern for the injustices and cruelties of the present social order. And the common aim of Christianity and Socialism is the perfection of the social order.

With agreement as to motive and aim, the only possible disagreements would be as to methods. Many Socialists there are who profess to repudiate with hatred and scorn, not only certain sects, creeds and dogmas, but Christianity itself. Many Christians there are who profess to repudiate with equal hatred and scorn, not only certain socialistic programs, platforms and propositions, but Socialism itself. An increasing number, among Socialists and Christians alike, are moved by the conviction that socialistic schemes, apart from the divine vitality of Christianity, will be ever inert and sterile, while Christian principles, apart from their application to the human realities of society, are perverted from their divine purpose. Hence, the demand that, in addition to the common motive and common aim of Socialism and Christianity, we now find such common methods as shall make complete an adequate and operative system of Christian Socialism.

To this end it will not be necessary for either party to champion every theory or proposal which may call itself by the name of Chris-

tianity or the name of Socialism. But it will be necessary for all concerned to understand one another better than at present. Christian men must give unprejudiced hearing to the cause of the Socialists and must invite reciprocal candor toward the cause of Christ. The Christian must thankfully honor the Socialist's noble faith that the brotherhood of man can really be made to work. The Socialist must thankfully honor the Christian's faith that the Fatherhood of God will make it work. The Christian must unlearn his notion that Socialism proposes nothing but social conflagration in this world. The Socialist must unlearn his notion that Christianity proposes nothing but insurance against spiritual conflagration in the world to come. Each must recognize in the other the witness of an exalted vision. Each must recognize in the other's vision his own from another angle. And finally both must seek the ways of working together in order that their visions at last may be embodied in the fact and substance of that co-operative commonwealth which will also be the new Jerusalem out of Heaven from God.

X

WHAT CHRISTIAN MEN SHOULD DO

"Christianity and the Labor Movement" is much more than a subject for thought. It is a call for action. As in the sacred story, so it is to-day: "While Peter thought on the vision, the Spirit said, Behold, three men seek thee;" after the vision, God's call to human service. And the book that tells the story is rightly called the book of *Acts*. And so, we now conclude these studies of the labor movement with the question, What to do? and with the answer in the motto of the Wesleyan Union for Social Service,—"See and Serve."

First, Christian men must see. It is no less than unchristian for us to act on prejudiced or partial views of the labor movement. Christian men should give to its study much of the same diligent attention which they apply to vital problems of their private business; for the King's business cannot be less vital.

One's attitude of mind is the first factor in a true understanding. A distinguished leader of the Church-brotherhood movement says with too much truth that "the average Church-man has been inclined to view the labor union merely

as an organization of malcontents whose particular purpose it is to 'run the business of the employer,' to declare strikes, to commit acts of violence and to demand higher wages." [1] The Christian whose social environment is not that of the working-class, or he who has had some exasperating experience in dealing with that class, will confess to nothing worse than human nature in frankly recognizing that he probably has prejudices which he ought promptly to detect and dispel. He must recognize at the least that unionism has come to stay; that the present social order makes it inevitable. He should also recognize that the way to bring unionism to its highest possibilities of good is to meet it with respect, candor and Christian fraternity. One who is a leader in the church and in the union says it is too generally true that union-men have formed the habit of anticipating little else than harsh and unintelligent criticism from churchmen. This, of course, tends to react by provoking on the part of the unionists the very perversities which have first been imputed to them. On the other hand, according to a familiar trait in all men, an imputed virtue tends to become an imparted virtue. Hence Christian men by manifest good-will can do

[1] W. B. Patterson: "Modern Church Brotherhoods," p. 220.

much to elicit reciprocal good-will. And good-will is prerequisite to a true understanding of the present social situation. To know the social problem we must know the men involved, and to know them we must first honor and love them.

The critical necessity of such an understanding appears when we consider that there are some sixteen millions of our citizens, half at least being in the churches, who must be the final arbitrators of the labor movement, the gravest responsibility which ever has been laid upon public conscience and judgment in any land. And it is not the unionist alone who fears that church-men are not yet competent to understand and judge the labor-movement. An accredited sociologist lately said: "It is a question in my mind whether those sixteen millions will serve as impartial arbitrators. In my opinion a good many of us who are now so solicitous about the rights of the working-men will scurry to cover as soon as the real demands of the laboring-classes appear." [2] And Professor Earp adds the comment that the great task of the Church to-day is so to educate this neutral group in righteousness, peace, and Christian brotherhood that they will be compelled to judge impartially, what-

[2] Professor A. S. Johnson in "The Journal of American Sociological Society," 1908, p. 155.

ever may be the ultimate demands of labor.[3]

To this end the accredited representatives of the labor movement should be everywhere and frequently invited to address the brotherhood chapters of the churches. They should there be encouraged to set forth frankly and fully the ideals and the claims of the unions. On such occasions they should never be "badgered" or "patronized." In many places such chapters may do well to hold "open forums" in which, from time to time, the labor problem shall be treated in its various aspects by competent speakers, followed by a general discussion open to any and all who desire to participate,—a plan already well-approved by experience. Mutual good-will has also been promoted where church brotherhoods have invited particular unions, or all the union officers in a city, to a supper followed by an evening of social enjoyment. To these social courtesies, as well as to the invitations for public hearings, the unions have sometimes reciprocated by like invitations given to the church-men. These courtesies will, however, be fatally vitiated if they are undertaken only as schemes to inveigle wage-earners into church attendance. Workingmen will not fail to "see through" such devices and will discount them accordingly. The only worthy and practical motive

[3] See "The Socialized Church," p. 86.

will be the honest purpose on the part of church-men to know the laboring-men, the labor-movement and the unions, face to face and heart to heart.

The men of every church should be organized for systematic study and discussion of these matters. In many churches this can best be done under the auspices of the brotherhood chapter. Two lines of study should be carefully followed. First, the social problem in general, including special attention to the labor problem. For this purpose two or three approved text-books should be read by all, while a few good reference volumes, one or two social service periodicals, at least one high-grade labor journal, and the bulletins of the Social Service Commission of the Federated Churches, should be conspicuously accessible in the reading-rooms of the Church or in the head-quarters of the chapter. The method of conducting such study-classes must depend on the conditions of each case. Often the men's class in the Sunday-school affords favorable opportunities, and everywhere such study is probably the most urgent matter with which these classes could be concerned.

A second study of imperative importance to Christian men is that of the social and labor conditions of their own local community. Through the social service committee of the

local brotherhood in co-operation with the united brotherhoods of the city, a careful and comprehenisve investigation should be made of local conditions as to wages and hours of labor, Sunday work, unemployment, the labor of women and children, immigrant labor, work-accidents, and industrial diseases, (and the relation of the two latter items to local poverty and pauperism), housing and sanitation as affecting the health of the working-classes, the local trade unions and their demands, local socialistic organizations and their spirit, strong drink as a local factor in the labor problem, and not the least, the attitude of the laboring classes toward religion and the churches. The aim of all such investigations should be, not merely to make a "survey," but to devise ways and means for civic betterment, to make happier and holier the lives of all the people in town. It should also be remarked that village and rural communities have their peculiar labor problems to which churchmen must not be indifferent.

Our churches, and especially their "brotherhood" chapters, must see to it that they are uncompromisingly democratic. It is not enough that wage-earners are permitted to "join" if they care to do so. They must be made to care. Their capacity for leadership should be duly honored by their frequent elec-

tion to the offices and by careful solicitude for their advice and co-operation. The social gatherings of the church, its receptions and banquets, should never be marked by such an excess of expense or "dress" as will be prohibitive or uncomfortable for the working class of the congregation. This can surely be avoided without going to the other extreme of making them cheap and shabby, which would be equally displeasing to self-respecting working-people. The heart of the matter is revealed in these words spoken by a labor leader to a company of Christian men: "The danger in the conflict is the bitterness of the class-feeling. Nothing will add so much to this bitterness as class churches."

Not only should the workingmen be active in the churches. Christian men should join the labor-unions whenever eligible. As a rule it is not the critical outsider but the co-operative insider who helps any organization to come to its highest usefulness. One cannot praise too highly the testimony of Bishop McIntyre of the Methodist Church that he glories in his membership in the union and his advice to the ministers to join some union whenever they can. Let laymen do likewise.

Besides assuming the attitude of courtesy and good-will and seeking close acquaintance with the labor problem and laboring men, there

remain many specific tasks which Christian men may take up in behalf of labor and in the name of Christ. Brotherhoods, like ministerial associations, may procure exchange of fraternal delegates with the unions. Brotherhood conventions may provide for a "labor-fellowship meeting" to be addressed by such men as John Mitchell or John B. Lennon. Church-men in the unions should encourage those organizations to appoint chaplains, as some unions have already done. Not only should unions in their campaigns for Sunday-rest find everywhere a fighting alliance with all church-men, but church-men in this behalf ought more often to open the campaign. When well approved social legislation is before legislative committees the representatives of the unions ought to be able to rely implicitly on finding by their side at every hearing the representatives of the churches. In every demand for social justice, whether made before public authorities, at the office of corporations or the bar of public opinion, wage-earners should be able to count on the unanimous and active support of church-men. Of course this involves "lobbying" and the like, and to any of us who are too dainty for such things, I would recommend the words of Walter Rauschenbusch: "There are probably few denominations which would hesitate a moment to fling their full force on a legisla-

ture if the tenure of their property or the freedom of their church was threatened. If it is right to lobby in their own behalf, it cannot well be wrong to lobby in behalf of the people." In most places a great opportunity is afforded by Labor Sunday preceding Labor Day in September. The pastor of the church will usually, on such occasions, welcome the co-operation of the brotherhood-chapter, not only because such co-operation re-enforces him in inviting the church attendance of workingmen, but because it re-enforces his attitude and utterances as their friend.

All this does not mean that the Church or church-men are to sanction every demand of every labor union, or in any other way to be partial or partisan. But it does mean that church-men are to stand for social justice everywhere, all the time and at any cost. It means that every demand of labor, whether wise or unwise, shall be heard with friendliness and judged without prejudice. It means that the Church shall stand, not merely for the charity that alleviates the symptoms, but for the justice that removes the causes, of our social ills. It means finally that Christianity can, and Christian men must, impart to the social order the only ideals and motives which can direct toward perfection the progress of mankind.

[4] "Christianity and the Social Crisis," p. 372-373.

26 HD 6338 .B253 1912 305
B1
Balch
Chris
mover
or
DATE DUE
UNITED THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

United Theological Seminary Library
MAIN HD6338.B253 1912
Balch, Willia Christianity and the labor
3 0645 0002 9907 9